UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

Beverly Goodwin, : Civil Action No.: 4:14-cv-1447

Plaintiff,

v.

Synerprise Consulting Services, Inc.,

COMPLAINT

JURY

Defendant.

For this Complaint, Plaintiff, Beverly Goodwin, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (the "FDCPA"), in its illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
 - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff, Beverly Goodwin ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Houston, Texas, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 5. Defendant, Synerprise Consulting Services, Inc. ("Synerprise"), is a Texas business entity with an address of 2809 Regal Road, Suite 107, Plano, Texas 75075, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

- 6. Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the "Debt") to an original creditor (the "Creditor").
- 7. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes, which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 8. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Synerprise for collection, or Synerprise was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 9. Defendant attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. Synerprise Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

- 10. In or around April 2014, Synerprise began calling Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.
- 11. During each call, Synerprise's representatives failed to identify the name of their company and failed to state that they were calling in an attempt to collect the Debt.
- 12. One of Synerprise's representatives told Plaintiff that there was "no statute of limitations on any form of debt collection."
- 13. Synerprise also told Plaintiff that it could bring a lawsuit against her to collect the Debt. However, did not have the present ability to bring a lawsuit against Plaintiff because the Debt was incurred outside the four (4) year statute of limitations in Texas.
- 14. In addition, Synerprise failed to send Plaintiff a letter regarding the Debt within five (5) days of its initial communication with Plaintiff.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

- 15. Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct.
- 16. As a direct consequence of Defendant's acts, practices and conduct, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

<u>COUNT I</u> <u>VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.</u>

- 17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 18. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendant engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff in connection with collection of the Debt.
- 19. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendant placed calls to Plaintiff without disclosing its identity.
- 20. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendant used false, deceptive and/or misleading representations or means in connection with collection of the Debt.
- 21. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2) in that Defendant misrepresented the legal status of the Debt.
- 22. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5) in that Defendant threatened to take legal action, without actually intending to do so.
- 23. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(11) in that Defendant failed to inform Plaintiff that communications were an attempt to collect the Debt.

- 24. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendant used unfair and unconscionable means to collect the Debt.
- 25. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a) in that Defendant failed to send Plaintiff a letter within five days of the initial communication.
- 26. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA.
 - 27. Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

VIOLATIONS OF THE TEXAS DEBT COLLECTION ACT TEX. FIN. CODE ANN. § 392, et al.

- 28. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
 - 29. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(1).
- 30. Defendant is a "debt collector" and a "third party debt collector" as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(6) and (7).
- 31. Defendant called Plaintiff and failed to identify the name of the debt collection agency, in violation of Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.302(2).
- 32. Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief and actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1) and (2) and to remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant:

- 1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- 2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- 3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C.

§ 1692k(a)(3);

- 4. Injunctive relief pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1);
- 5. Actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(2);
- 6. Remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a);
- 7. Punitive damages; and
- 8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: May 23, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Jenny DeFrancisco

Jenny DeFrancisco, Esq. CT Bar No.: 432383 LEMBERG LAW LLC A Connecticut Law Firm 1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor Stamford, CT 06905

Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424